

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the preceding amendments and the following comments.

Supporting texts for the amendments to the respective claims with regard to the specific conditions for the several measurements are found in the description a) on page 3, line 20, to page 4, line 2; b) on page 4, lines 3 to 12; and c) on page 7, line 18, to page 8, line 1.

The objection to claims 1 to 20 is respectfully traversed. Each reference to "as measured under specific conditions" has been amplified by a precise enumeration of the conditions involved, thus overcoming any holding of lack of clarity. The misspelling in claim 7 has also been corrected.

The rejection of claims 1 to 20 "under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Muto et al." is also respectfully traversed. According to the present invention, a tank joint part, is made of a resinous material satisfying certain requirements under specific conditions. These requirements and specific conditions are specifically defined in claims 1, 2, 8, 9 and 10.

Although Muto presents "a tank joint part 31A welded to a resinous outer surface 31 of a fuel tank for joining another device thereto, and made of resinous material", he fails to disclose a resinous material satisfying the requirements called for by Applicants' claimed invention. Further, there is no disclosure or suggestion of specific conditions to judge whether such requirements have been fulfilled

A tank joint part disclosed in Fig 2 of Muto is clearly different from Applicants' claimed tank joint part. First, Muto's part substantially corresponding to a tank joint part is only 31A in Fig. 2. Part 33 is considered to be merely a sealing member which cannot act as a tank joint, and thus would not correspond to a main member or a joining member in the present invention. There's no disclosure such that 31A and 33 are a unitary product of two-color injection molding, either.

As described above, Muto neither discloses nor suggests what is called for by Applicants' claimed invention.


Applicants have noted the prior art made of record and not relied upon. Since no ground of rejection has been based thereon, further discussion thereof does not appear to be in order at this time.

Having overcome all outstanding grounds of rejection, the application is now in condition for allowance, and early action toward that end is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

JACOBSON HOLMAN PLLC

Date: October 1, 2003
(202) 638-6666
400 Seventh Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
IMA/cmd
Atty. Dkt. No.: 11981/P67646US0

By 
Irwin M. Aisenberg
Registration No. 19,007